IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
ORDINARY ORIGINAL CIVIL JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO.2254 OF 1994

Bhaskar Sitaram Joshi ...Petitioner.

Versus

Union of India & Ors. ...Respondents.

....

Mr.B.S.Joshi, petitioner-in-person present.
Mr.Y.R.Mishra with Mr.N.D.Sharma, Advocate for Respondent No.1-Union of India.

....

CORAM : **DR.S.RADHAKRISHNAN AND SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,JJ.**

DATED : **NOVEMBER 13, 2006.**

P.C.:

. Heard Mr.B.S.Joshi petitioner-in-person and Mr.Y.R.Mishra the learned counsel for Respondent No.1-Union of India.

2. The issue involved in the above petition is with regard to excess telephone billing as alleged by the petitioner. The petitioner who is present in-person states that there is a Suit filed by the Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Ltd., against the petitioner being Suit No.3687 of 1995 in this Court. Having regard to the facts and circumstances of the case and in view of the

provisions of Section 7(B) of the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885, the Central Government has to appoint an Arbitrator for the purposes of resolving the above matter.

3. Mr.Mishra the learned counsel for Respondent No.1-Union of India states that within a period of eight weeks from today the respondent No.1-Union of India will appoint an Arbitrator in the above matter to resolve the dispute with regard to the alleged excess billing. The learned Arbitrator while deciding the said dispute shall take into consideration the case of petitioner and Respondent Nos.2, 3 & 4 including the claim in the aforesaid Suit, as expeditiously as possible preferably within a period of four months thereafter.

4. Rule is made absolute accordingly.

[DR.S.RADHAKRISHNAN,J.]

[SMT.V.K.TAHILRAMANI,J.]